

CONSULTANT SELECTION COMBINED CONSENSUS SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description	
Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel	
Columbia Cottage	
Project Number	
2022-410	
Name of Selection Panel Chair	
Tim Byrne	

	This Scoresnee	31 Becomes	Public Reco	ra		111111	Dyinc .	
Phase 1 - SOQ		Date:	8/12/2021			Number of Subn	nitting Firms:	: 3
Firms		Tim Byrne Rank Order	Robert Fossum Rank Order	Megan Celedonia Rank Order	Kevin Sparkman Rank Order	Trent Hart Rank Order	TOTAL PANEL RANKED SCORE	PHASE 1 RANK ORDER
1 KMD		1	2	3	1	2	9	1
2 KMB		3	1	1	2	3	10	2
3 DLR		2	3	2	3	1	11	3
4 5 6								
7 8 9								_
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								<u> </u>
18								<u> </u>
19								
20								<u> </u>
Phase 2 Interview	1	Date:				lumber of Firms	Interviewed:	3
			RANK ORDE	R OF COMMITTE	E MEMBERS	1	1	
	Firms	Tim Byrne	Robert Fossum	Megan Celedonia	Kevin Sparkman	Trent Hart	TOTAL ASSIGNED RANKS	FINAL RANK ORDER
		Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order	Rank Order		
1 DLR		1	1	1	1	1	5	1
2 KMB		3	2	3	3	3	14	3
3 KMD		2	3	2	2	2	11	2
4		ز						
5								
			· /.					

Tim Byrne

Megan Celedonia

Naw+ Hart

Robert Fossum

Kevin Sparkman



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description
Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel
Columbia Cottage

Consensus Date Project Number

8/12/2021

Name of Selection Panel Member

Tim Byrne

2022-410

CRITERIA	Qualification of Key Personnel Relevent Experience		Past Performance		(Not Used)		(Not Used)			TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER		
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	40%	Raw Score	30%					SCORE	SCORE	
1 KMD	90.0	27.0	95.0	38.0	70.0	21.0					255.0	86.0	1
2 KMB	80.0	24.0	80.0	32.0	50.0	15.0					210.0	71.0	3
3 DLR	85.0	25.5	75.0	30.0	70.0	21.0					230.0	76.5	2
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14		·		·									
15													

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

COMMENTS:

Tim Byrne

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project	de	scription

Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel Columbia Cottage

Date of Evaluation

Project Number

8/25/2021

2022-410

Name of Selection Panel Member

Tim Byrne

CDITEDIA	Mainhai	DLR Group		KN	ИΒ	KMD					
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	80.0	12.0	80.0	12.0	82.0	12.3				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	for the Clien	nt. What is t	heir philoso _l	ohy towords	working coll	aboratively v	vith clients a	and other out	ward lookin	g issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wha	at role are th	ey assumin	g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo	oad for the du	uration of the	project and	how this pr	oject fits into	the firm's o	verall plann	ing			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	95.0	23.8	80.0	20.0	80.0	20.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the loopject scope in the past.	inalist's expe	erience, how	well has the	e team acert	ained basic	project requ	irements ar	nd how well h	ave they ma	anaged deve	lopment o
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budgets	s. How succ	essful have	they been w	ith past proj	ects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule need	ds and then	meet client s	chedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	95.0	23.8	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that project and the project requirements <u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define c						formational r	ntg, or done	e independer	t research t	to better und	erstand ti
EXPERIENCE	15%	92.0	13.8	85.0	12.8	90.0	13.5				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fire	m has done	and <i>how</i> th	at relates or	provides gu	idance for th	nis project?				
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te		have exper	ience that re	elates to the	project type	or complex	ity?	,		1	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	Not Scored										
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Land ELCCA?	ife Cycle Cos	st exercise i	n decision m	naking? Are	they familia	r with the OF	M requirem	nents? Are t	hey differen	tiating betwe	en LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	80.0	8.0	70.0	7.0	80.0	8.0				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this project	ct. How can	the sustain	ability strate	gys mesh w	ith the projec	ct budget.	•		•	
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
	Coorda	1100	1	1000	1	100.0	1	1		1	
TOTAL Raw SCORE TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE		442.0	81.3	400.0	73.0	422.0	76.3				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:			<u> </u>	<u>I</u>		<u> </u>		<u> </u>		i .	
	Æ					0/05/0004					

Tim Byrne

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Selection Panel may consider all factors relevant to its decision including but not limited to Proposal content, the skills of proposed team members, references, personal knowledge, and design solution. The information provided in response to the Evaluation Section of the RFP will be scored based on the following:

- A. The Finalist Consultant Team's understanding of the basic project requirements.
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Consultant Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Finalist Team's management plan for the project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP, but also any other component or element that the Proposed Finalist Team deems essential to the success of the Project.

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the interview and discussion. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the Finalists for each Selection Criterion, based on the weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda. After initial scoring, the selection team will come to a consensus ranking of the Firms.

Excellent (81-100 percent of points available in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to exceed the Project Goals and the RFQ requirements and provide a consistently outstanding level of quality. To be considered *Excellent*, it must be determined to have significant strengths and/or a number of minor strengths and few or no appreciable weaknesses.

Good (61-80 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to meet the RFQ in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project) and offers quality. To be considered *Good*, it must be determined to have strengths and few, if any, significant weaknesses. Minor weaknesses are offset by strengths.

Fair (41-60 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains minor and/or significant weaknesses and limited appreciable strengths.

Deficient (0-40 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains significant weaknesses and no appreciable strengths.

Non-Responsive: Does not meet the Minimum Qualifications required for evaluation. In addition, the Owner, at its sole discretion, may reject any Evaluative Criteria deemed non-responsive to any of the requirements.



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description Maple Lane Correct	ctions Center, Remodel						
Columbia Cottage							
Consensus Date	Project Number						
8/12/2021	2022-410						

Name of Selection Panel Member

Robert Fossum

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERI	A	Qualification of Key Personnel		Relevent Experience		Past Performance		(Not Used)		(Not Used)		TOTAL RAW	WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	40%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score		Raw Score		SCORE	SCORE	ORDE
1 KMD		83.0	24.9	84.0	33.6	85.0	25.5					252.0	84.0	2
2 KMB		83.0	24.9	85.0	34.0	85.0	25.5					253.0	84.4	1
3 DLR		82.0	24.6	82.0	32.8	85.0	25.5					249.0	82.9	3
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														

Robert J. Foss	
	8/12/2021
Robert Fossum	Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Maple Lane Corrections Center	er, Remodel Columbia
Cottage	
Date of Evaluation	Project Number
8/23/2021	2022-410
Name of Selection Panel Member	
Robert Fos	sum

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

			_R	K	ИB	K	KMD				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	91.0	13.7	89.0	13.4	85.0	12.8				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project					U	laboratively	with clients a	and other ou	tward lookin	ıg issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre				g in the disc	ussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their worklo				d how this pr	oject fits int	o the firm's o	overall plann	ing			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	89.0	22.3	90.0	22.5	88.0	22.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the F project scope in the past.	inalist's expe	erience, how	well has the	e team acer	tained basic	project requ	uirements ar	nd how well I	nave they m	anaged dev	elopment
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e	stablish and	manage pro	ject budgets	s. How succ	essful have	they been w	ith past pro	ects			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule need	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	91.0	22.8	89.0	22.3	89.0	22.3				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements	they have rev		. ,		attended in	formational	mtg, or done	e independe	nt research	to better und	derstand
Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c	hallenges an	d/or opportu	ınities they s	see for the p	roject?						
EXPERIENCE	15%	90.0	13.5	90.0	13.5	89.0	13.4				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual tea	am members Not	have expe	rience that r	elates to the	project type	or complex	tity?				
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	Scored										
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA?	ife Cycle Cos	st exercise i	n decision n	naking? Are	they familia	r with the O	FM requiren	nents? Are	hey differen	tiating betwe	een LCCA
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	89.0	8.9	86.0	8.6	86.0	8.6				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate t	or this project	ct. How car	the sustain	ability strate	gys mesh w	ith the proje	ct budget.				
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	Not Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	#VALUE!	450.0		444.0		437.0					
			81.1		80.2		79.0				
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE											

Robert J. toss	8/26/2021
Robert Fossum	Date

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Selection Panel may consider all factors relevant to its decision including but not limited to Proposal content, the skills of proposed team members, references, personal knowledge, and design solution. The information provided in response to the Evaluation Section of the RFP will be scored based on the following:

- A. The Finalist Consultant Team's understanding of the basic project requirements.
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Consultant Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Finalist Team's management plan for the project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP, but also any other component or element that the Proposed Finalist Team deems essential to the success of the Project.

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the interview and discussion. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the Finalists for each Selection Criterion, based on the weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda. After initial scoring, the selection team will come to a consensus ranking of the Firms.

Excellent (81-100 percent of points available in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to exceed the Project Goals and the RFQ requirements and provide a consistently outstanding level of quality. To be considered Excellent, it must be determined to have significant strengths and/or a number of minor strengths and few or no appreciable weaknesses.

Good (61-80 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to meet the RFQ in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project) and offers quality. To be considered *Good*, it must be determined to have strengths and few, if any, significant weaknesses. Minor weaknesses are offset by strengths.

Fair (41-60 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains minor and/or significant weaknesses and limited appreciable strengths.

Deficient (0-40 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains significant weaknesses and no appreciable strengths.

Non-Responsive: Does not meet the Minimum Qualifications required for evaluation. In addition, the Owner, at its sole discretion, may reject any Evaluative Criteria deemed non-responsive to any of the requirements.



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description Maple Lane Correction	ns Center, Remodel
Columbia	Cottage
Consensus Date	Project Number
8/12/2021	2022-410
 Megan Ce	eledonia

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CRITERIA	Qualific Key Per		Rele Exper		Past Perf	ormance	(Not l	Jsed)	(Not	Used)		TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Score	s Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	40%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score		Raw Score		SCORE	SCORE	
1 KMD	81.0	24.3	81.0	32.4	81.0	24.3					243.0	81.0	3
2 KMB	82.0	24.6	82.0	32.8	83.0	24.9					247.0	82.3	1
3 DLR	83.0	24.9	81.0	32.4	83.0	24.9					247.0	82.2	2
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													
COMMENTS:	•		•		•		•		•	•	•	•	

| 8/12/2021 | Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description
Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel Columbia
Cottage

Date of Evaluation Project Number

8/25/2021 2022-410

Name of Selection Panel Member

Megan Celedonia

		DI	_R	KI	ИΒ	KI	ИD				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighte Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	82.0	12.3	76.0	11.4	80.0	12.0				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this projec	for the Clier	nt. What is t	heir philoso	phy towords	working col	laboratively	with clients a	and other ou	tward looking	g issues.	
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workle	oad for the du	uration of the	project and	d how this pr	oject fits into	the firm's o	verall plann	ing			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	83.0	20.8	75.0	18.8	78.0	19.5				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the f project scope in the past. Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e						. ,			nave they ma	anaged deve	elopment
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client so	chedule need	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	83.0	20.8	72.0	18.0	75.0	18.8				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define c						formational	mtg, or done	e independe	nt research t	o better und	erstand
<u> </u>	15%	83.0	12.5	75.0	11.3	83.0	12.5				
		00.0	12.0			03.0					
		m has done	and how th	at relates or		idance for th	nis project?				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas	t work the fir				provides gu						
EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	t work the fir am members				provides gu						
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	t work the fir am members Not Scored	have exper	rience that r	elates to the	provides gu project type	or complex	ity?	nents? Are t	they differen	tiating betwe	en LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Land ELCCA?	t work the fir am members Not Scored	have exper	rience that r	elates to the	provides gu project type	or complex	ity?	nents? Are t	they differen	tiating betwe	en LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L	t work the fir am members Not Scored ife Cycle Cos	s have exper	n decision n	naking? Are	provides gu project type they familia 7.8	e or complex or with the Ol	ity? FM requirem	nents? Are t	they differen	tiating betwe	en LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive L and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	t work the fir am members Not Scored ife Cycle Cos	s have exper	n decision n	naking? Are	provides gu project type they familia 7.8	e or complex or with the Ol	ity? FM requirem	nents? Are t	they differen	tiating betwe	en LCC,
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive Land ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	t work the fir am members Not Scored ife Cycle Cos 10% for this project Not	s have exper	n decision n	naking? Are	provides gu project type they familia 7.8	e or complex or with the Ol	ity? FM requirem	nents? Are t	ihey differen	tiating betwe	en LCC
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team to the Individual team to the Individual team to the Individual team understand the value in a comprehensive Land ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	t work the fir am members Not Scored ife Cycle Co: 10% for this project Not Scored	s have expense in the state of	n decision n	elates to the naking? Are 78.0 ability strate	provides gu project type they familia 7.8	e or complex Ir with the Ol 80.0 ith the project	ity? FM requirem	nents? Are t	ihey differen	tiating betwe	en LCC.

COMMENTS: **DLR** national firm lots of experience; join up with Salus - good healthcare experience; excellent assessment of approach to systems and spaces on campus to assist in making value for the dollar decisions; budget development approach is well thought out and easy to understand; uses approprate terminology for trauma informed risk design; good exp. sustainable practices; most direct responses to questions - informed, articulate, responsive. **KMD**: Have NGRI expert available, 26% diverse business goals; in business a lot time with focus on healthcare and BH; prices estimated using previous projects; uses evidence based design and best practices. Didn't respond to the panels questions as directly as would have liked - indicated would plan in advance to prevent issues which is not always possible. Important to understand how they will partner when issues and problems do arise. **KMB**: lots of work with DSHS; worked on campus in the sister Cascade unit; project approach not as refined as other applicants, very causual in approach to the interview, did not get to meet partner in charge, did not respond as directly and clearly to questions as would have preferred.

8/25/2021

Date

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Selection Panel may consider all factors relevant to its decision including but not limited to Proposal content, the skills of proposed team members, references, personal knowledge, and design solution. The information provided in response to the Evaluation Section of the RFP will be scored based on the following:

- A. The Finalist Consultant Team's understanding of the basic project requirements.
- B. The degree to which the Proposed Consultant Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the project; and
- C. The strength of the Proposed Finalist Team's management plan for the project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP, but also any other component or element that the Proposed Finalist Team deems essential to the success of the Project.

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the interview and discussion. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the Finalists for each Selection Criterion, based on the weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda. After initial scoring, the selection team will come to a consensus ranking of the Firms.

Excellent (81-100 percent of points available in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to exceed the Project Goals and the RFQ requirements and provide a consistently outstanding level of quality. To be considered Excellent, it must be determined to have significant strengths and/or a number of minor strengths and few or no appreciable weaknesses.

Good (61-80 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to meet the RFQ in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project) and offers quality. To be considered Good, it must be determined to have strengths and few, if any, significant weaknesses. Minor weaknesses are offset by strengths.

Fair (41-60 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains minor and/or significant weaknesses and limited appreciable strengths.

Deficient (0-40 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains significant weaknesses and no appreciable strengths.

Non-Responsive: Does not meet the Minimum Qualifications required for evaluation. In addition, the Owner, at its sole discretion, may reject any Evaluative Criteria deemed non-responsive to any of the requirements.



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET

Project description	
Maple Lane Correction	ns Center, Remodel
Columbia	Cottage
Consensus Date	Project Number
8/12/2021	2022-410
Name of Selection Panel Member	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Kevin Sparkman

CRITERIA	Qualification Perso		Rele Exper		Past Perfe	ormance	(Not I	Jsed)	(Not	Used)	TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	40%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score		Raw Score		SCORE	SCORE	
1 KMD	80.0	24.0	78.0	31.2	40.0	12.0					198.0	67.2	1
2 KMB	74.0	22.2	82.0	32.8	38.0	11.4					194.0	66.4	2
3 DLR	75.0	22.5	79.0	31.6	39.0	11.7					193.0	65.8	3
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
10													
11													
12													
13													
14													
15													
16													
17													
18													
19													
20													

-	\sim	\ B /	1 1 1		N 1-	rs.
	٠.)I\/	HV/I	_	IVI	

KMB has a experience advantage since they completed the Cascade cottage remodel and this project is similar,

KMD seems to have a stronger professional team.

All three submissions were weak on past performance, KMB did not provide budget performance data

Kevin Sparkman	
	8/12/2021
Kevin Sparkman	Date

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

Project description
Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel Columbia
Cottage

Date of Evaluation
8/25/2021

Name of Selection Panel Member

Kevin Sparkman

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Tills Scoresheet De	comes	Fublic	Record				Veal	ii Spair	Millali		
CRITERIA	Maighting		LR	KI	ИΒ	KI	/ID				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	83.0	12.5	81.0	12.2	82.0	12.3				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	t for the Clie	nt. What is	their philoso	phy towords	working co	llaboratively	with clients	and other o	utward look	ing issues.	
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wh	at role are th	ney assumir	ng in the disc	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workl	oad for the d	uration of th	e project an	d how this p	roject fits in	to the firm's	overall plan	ning			,
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	85.0	21.3	75.0	18.8	80.0	20.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has th	ne team ace	rtained basi	c project red	uirements a	nd how well	have they i	managed de	velopmen'
of project scope in the past.											
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e			<i>-</i>					<u> </u>			
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	n to client s	chedule nee	ds and then	meet client	schedule ne	eeds.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	85.0	21.3	75.0	18.8	83.0	20.8				
<u>Understanding of this project</u> : Has the Finalist demonstrated that the project and the project requirements						nformationa	l mtg, or dor	ne independ	ent researc	h to better ur	nderstand
<u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define of					•			I	I		
EXPERIENCE	15%	80.0	12.0	85.0	12.8	83.0	12.5				
Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pas											
Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	am members T Not									<u> </u>	
LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	Scored		80		0		0				
Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive land ELCCA?	Life Cycle Co	st exercise	in decision	making? Ar	e they famili	ar with the C	OFM require	ments? Are	they differe	entiating betv	veen LCC
SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	10%	83.0	8.3	81.0	8.1	82.0	8.2				
What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate	for this proje	ect. How car	n the sustair	nability strate	egys mesh v	with the proje	ect budget.	!			
DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	Not										
(indicate included or not included)	Scored										
TOTAL Raw SCORE	#VALUE!	496.0		477.0		490.0					
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE			75.3		70.5		73.7				
FINAL RANK ORDER			1		3		2				
COMMENTS:											

Kevin Sparkman

Kevin Sparkman

8/26/2021

Date



CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE I SCORING SHEET Project description

Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel Columbia Cottage

Consensus Date

Project Number

8/12/2021

2022-410

Name of Selection Panel Member

Trent Hart

CRITERIA		Qualifica Key Per		Rele Exper		Past Perfe	ormance	(Not U	Jsed)	(Not l	Jsed)	TOTAL RAW	TOTAL WEIGHTED	RANK ORDER
	Scores	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score	40%	Raw Score	30%	Raw Score		Raw Score		SCORE	SCORE	ORDER
1 KMD		27.0	8.1	35.0	14.0	28.0	8.4					90.0	30.5	2
2 KMB		27.0	8.1	35.0	14.0	27.0	8.1					89.0	30.2	3
3 DLR		30.0	9.0	40.0	16.0	30.0	9.0					100.0	34.0	1
4														10000
5													FC1105F93	Barata,
6														
7					-									
8													7 July 2006	
9														
10														
11														
12														-
13														1000
14														
15													1001653	
16														
17														
18														
19														A SECTION
20														
COMMENTS:				1									A STATE OF THE STA	

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

CONSULTANT SELECTION PHASE II - PROPOSAL SCORING SHEET

This Scoresheet Becomes Public Record

Project description

Maple Lane Corrections Center, Remodel Columbia Cottage

Date of Evaluation 00.25.202/

2022-410

Project Number

Name of Selection Panel Member

Trent Hart, AIA

						1					
			LR	K	MB	KN	/ID				
CRITERIA	Weighting	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Raw Score	Weighte Score
ORGANIZATION	15%	95.0	14.3	95.0	14.3	95.0	14.3				
Management Plan: How is the team set up to manage this project	t for the Clier	nt. What is	their philoso	ophy towords				and other o			
Team Member Qualifications: Are the relevent team members pre	sent and wha	at role are th	hey assumir	ng in the disc	cussion						
Capacity/Prodution Capabilities: Does the firm explain their workl	oad for the d	uration of th	ne project ar	nd how this p	project fits in	nto the firm's	overall plan	ning			
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	25%	95.0	23.8	90.0	22.5	92.0	23.0				
Scope Management: Based on the information provided and the	Finalist's exp	erience, ho	w well has t	he team ace	rtained bas	ic project red	uirements a	and how well	have they	managed de	velopme
of project scope in the past.								· ,			
Budgeting & Cost Control: What strategies does the firm use to e											
Project Scheduling: How does this finalist team develop schedule	s. How well	do they liste	en to client	schedule ne	eds and the	n meet clien	t schedule r	needs.			
PROJECT APPROACH	25%	100.0	25.0	85.0	21.3	90.0	22.5		5.8		
Understanding of this project: Has the Finalist demonstrated that	they have re	viewed avai	ilable projec	t information	attended i	nformationa	mta or do	ne independ	ent researc	h to better ui	nderstan
the project and the project requirements											
the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define of	challenges ar	nd/or opport		see for the	project?					I	
he project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define EXPERIENCE	challenges ar	nd/or opport	tunities they	see for the	project?	100.0	15.0				
the project and the project requirements <u>Challenges & Opportunities</u> : Has the Finalist attempted to define of the company of the second of the company of the second of the company of the second of	challenges ar 15% t work the fire	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done	tunities they 15.0 and <i>how</i> th	see for the 85.0	project? 12.8 r provides g	100.0 uidance for t	15.0 his project?				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te	challenges ar 15% t work the fire	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have expe	tunities they 15.0 and how the	see for the 85.0 nat relates to the	project? 12.8 r provides g	100.0 uidance for t	15.0 his project?				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE	t work the firm	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have exper	tunities they 15.0 and how the trience that records	see for the 85.0 nat relates or relates to the	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ	100.0 uidance for t e or complex	15.0 his project? city?				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive	t work the firm	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have exper	tunities they 15.0 and how the trience that records	see for the 85.0 nat relates or relates to the	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ	100.0 uidance for t e or complex	15.0 his project? city?				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define a EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA?	t work the firm	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have exper	tunities they 15.0 and how the trience that records	see for the 85.0 nat relates or relates to the	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ	100.0 uidance for t e or complex	15.0 his project? city?				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define a EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pass Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE	t work the firm members Not Scored Life Cycle Co	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have experience 10 est exercise	tunities they 15.0 and how the rience that roop in decision	see for the 85.0 nat relates or elates to the making? Ar	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ 00 re they famil	100.0 uidance for the or complex graph of the or compl	15.0 his project? city? 5 DFM require				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define of EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss pastelevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual team team team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	t work the firm members Not Scored Life Cycle Co	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have experimental to the state of the	tunities they 15.0 and how the rience that roop in decision	see for the 85.0 nat relates or elates to the making? Ar 85.0 nability strate	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ 00 re they famil	100.0 uidance for the or complex	15.0 his project? city? 5 DFM require				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define a EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN	t work the firm members Not Scored Life Cycle Co	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have experimental to the state of the	tunities they 15.0 and how the rience that roop in decision 9.5 n the sustain	see for the 85.0 nat relates or elates to the making? Ar 85.0 nability strate	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ 00 re they famil	100.0 uidance for the or complex	15.0 his project? city? 5 DFM require 9.5 ect budget.				
the project and the project requirements Challenges & Opportunities: Has the Finalist attempted to define a EXPERIENCE Relevant Past Projects (firm): Does the Finalist team discuss past Relevant Past Projects (key team members): Do the individual te LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS EXPERIENCE Does the Finalist team understand the value in a comprehensive and ELCCA? SUSTAINABLE DESIGN EXPERIENCE What strategies have the Finalists indicated might be appropriate DIVERSE BUSINESS INCLUSION PLAN (indicate included or not included)	t work the firm members Not Scored Life Cycle Co	nd/or opport 100.0 m has done s have experience 10 ost exercise 95.0 ct. How car	tunities they 15.0 and how the rience that roop in decision 9.5 n the sustain	see for the 85.0 nat relates or elates to the making? Ar 85.0 nability strate	project? 12.8 r provides g e project typ 00 re they famil	100.0 uidance for the or complex graph of the or compl	15.0 his project? city? 5 DFM require 9.5 ect budget.				

Trent Hart, AIA

8/25/2021 Date

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

The Selection Panel may consider all factors relevant to its decision including but not limited to Proposal content, the skills of proposed team members, references, personal knowledge, and design solution. The information provided in response to the Evaluation Section of the RFP will be scored based on the following:

A. The Finalist Consultant Team's understanding of the basic project requirements.

B. The degree to which the Proposed Consultant Team understands the Owner's/DES' goals and objectives with respect to the project; and

C. The strength of the Proposed Finalist Team's management plan for the project, including not only the specific topics and specialized components outlined in the RFP, but also any other component or element that the Proposed Finalist Team deems essential to the success of the Project.

SCORING GUIDELINES

In evaluating each of the criteria, the Selection Panel will identify significant and minor strengths and weaknesses from the interview and discussion. The Selection Panel will then use the following guidelines to evaluate the Finalists for each Selection Criterion, based on the weighting assigned in the RFQ and any addenda. After initial scoring, the selection team will come to a consensus ranking of the Firms.

Excellent (81-100 percent of points available in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to exceed the Project Goals and the RFQ requirements and provide a consistently outstanding level of quality. To be considered *Excellent*, it must be determined to have significant strengths and/or a number of minor strengths and few or no appreciable weaknesses.

Good (61-80 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that is considered to meet the RFQ in a beneficial way (providing advantages, benefits, or added value to the Project) and offers quality. To be considered *Good*, it must be determined to have strengths and few, if any, significant weaknesses. Minor weaknesses are offset by strengths.

Fair (41-60 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains minor and/or significant weaknesses and limited appreciable strengths.

Deficient (0-40 percent of available points in each criterion): The Evaluative Criteria demonstrates an approach that contains significant weaknesses and no appreciable strengths.

Non-Responsive: Does not meet the Minimum Qualifications required for evaluation. In addition, the Owner, at its sole discretion, may reject any Evaluative Criteria deemed non-responsive to any of the requirements.